

MEMORANDUM

TO: Michael G. Herring, City Administrator

FROM: Teresa J. Price, Director of Planning

DATE: October 25, 2004

SUBJECT: Planning & Zoning Committee Meeting Summary – **October 21, 2004**

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Committee of the Chesterfield City Council was held at 5:30 p.m., on Thursday, October 21, 2004 in Conference Room 101.

In attendance were: **Chair Bruce Geiger** (Ward II); **Councilmember Jane Durrell** (Ward I); **Councilmember Connie Fults** (Ward IV) and **Councilmember Dan Hurt** (Ward III). Also in attendance were Councilmember Mike Casey (Ward III); Planning Commission Chair Victoria Sherman; Director of Planning Teresa Price; Senior Planner Annissa McCaskill-Clay; and Mary Ann Madden, Planning Assistant.

Chair Geiger called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to approve the Meeting Summary of October 7, 2004. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

II. OLD BUSINESS - None

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **P.Z. 02-2004 Summit Development (Valley Gates Buildings):** A request for a change in zoning from an “NU” Non-Urban District to “PC” Planned Commercial District for an approximately 7.698-acre tract of land located on North Outer Forty Road east of Boone’s Crossing. The petitioner proposes two mixed commercial buildings.

Chair Geiger announced that a fax has been received from the petitioner for Summit Development asking the Committee to hold their petition until the next meeting on November 4, 2004.

Councilmember Durrell made a motion to hold **P.Z. 02-2004 Summit Development (Valley Gates Building)** until the Planning & Zoning Committee Meeting of November 4, 2004. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed** by a **voice vote of 4 to 0.**

- B. Stoneridge Office Building (Tristar):** An amendment to City of Chesterfield Ordinance 1943, allowing 250 surface parking spaces in lieu of twenty (20) for the Stoneridge Office Building a “PC” Planned Commercial District located on the south side of South Outer Forty Road, northeast of Yarmouth Point Drive and Candish Lane.

Senior Planner Annissa McCaskill-Clay gave background information on the project and stated that Ordinance 1943 for Stoneridge Office Building was approved July 31, 2003. The Preliminary Plan showed a four-story office building with 130,000 sq. ft. of space. The petitioner has requested a text amendment to allow 250 surface parking spaces instead of 20 spaces. The new Preliminary Plan shows the parking structure removed, along with a reduction in the size of the building.

On October 11, 2004, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the text amendment by a vote of 7 to 1 with the following conditions:

- The Attachment A to allow 250 parking spaces in lieu of 20 parking or a parking structure.
- City Council to review the maximum building size in the Attachment A.
- City Council to review the “do-not-disturb” area, originally shown on the Preliminary Plan but not shown on the new proposed plan.

Mr. Larry Chapman, petitioner, addressed the Committee and stated that Step One is requesting approval of the text amendment allowing the 250 surface parking spaces in lieu of garage parking and Step Two is requesting approval of the Site Development Plan. A meeting has been held with the residents of Chesterfield Hill Subdivision and a second meeting is scheduled for November 1, 2004. The petitioner and the residents have agreed to the following:

- The proposed earthen berm will be eliminated.
- The utilities will be moved as far to the east as possible.
- A landscaping plan will be provided to show how the common areas will be buffered, along with some of the homes.
- A deed restriction provision for the non-disturb areas.

After the November 1st meeting, it is anticipated that the Site Development Plan will be presented for approval.

Mr. Chapman stated at this time he has a tenant interested in the property who has a special requirement that would allow for a smaller building and less density in the same envelope of disturbance. Mr. Chapman went on to say that there would be less

land disturbance overall than the original proposal. At this time, he is asking for the approval of **either** the 250 surface parking spaces in lieu of the parking structure **or** the original proposal with the parking structure and 20 surface parking spaces.

Mr. Howard Zinschlag, a resident of Chesterfield Hill Subdivision, stated that the residents were very surprised when the deed restriction was not in the final ordinance. They would prefer to see the whole package before anything is agreed to; however, if Mr. Chapman is asking for the text amendment to have all surface parking in lieu of a garage, the residents are not opposed to it. Mr. Zinschlag stated that after the meeting of October 12, 2004, the residents and the petitioner had come to a majority consensus on almost all issues.

Councilmember Durrell asked why the residents were opposed to the proposed earthen berm. Mr. Zinschlag replied that (1) the location of the berm does nothing for most of the homeowners; (2) in order to create the berm, dozens of trees would have to be removed; and (3) when transporting dirt for the berm, the truck traffic would impact the soil by damaging the root structure of all the trees that serve as a natural buffer to the homes on Candish Lane.

General discussion was held with respect to increasing the allowable square footage of the proposed office building from 54,000 sq. ft. to 55,000 sq. ft.; tying the 250 surface parking spaces to a 55,000 sq. ft. office building; having the deed restriction put in place before the vote by City Council; the proposed office building height being approximately 590' and the proposed elevation of the surface parking being 550'-558'; the proposed light standards being flat-lensed and fully-shielded; the deed restriction being part of the lawsuit settlement; and the deed restriction being part of the Attachment A for the amended Ordinance.

Before it is presented to Council, Mr. Chapman asked for the opportunity to review the language being proposed for the ordinance with respect to the deed restriction for the non-disturb areas.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion directing Staff to amend Section V. SITE SPECIFIC CRITERIA, A.7. Landscape Plan, page 8 of the Attachment A to read:

- f. *The limits of disturbance for the natural buffer **shall be as exhibited in Attachment B.***

On the western boundary of the subject site, the limits shall be a minimum of one hundred (100) feet from all property lines in Chesterfield Hill Subdivision except that with respect to the northeast corner of Lot 161 such disturbance shall be no closer than seventy (70) feet to the northeast corner of Lot 161.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fults and **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion directing Staff to amend Section V. SITE SPECIFIC CRITERIA, A.12. Miscellaneous, page 11 of the Attachment A to read:

- d. *Prior to granting of a grading permit, proof of a recorded deed restriction must be provided to the City of Chesterfield. Said deed restriction shall be for the limits of disturbance referenced in Section V.A. 7.f. (Landscape Plan).*

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fults and **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

Councilmember Geiger made a motion to Amend Section II, FLOOR AREA, HEIGHT, BUILDING AND PARKING STRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS, A.1. FLOOR AREA, page 2 of the Attachment A to include:

:

- b. *In the event of a structure not exceeding 55,000 square feet being built, a parking structure shall not be permitted and the maximum number of surface parking spaces shall be limited to 250. Note that the square footage for the building is exclusive of basement storage, mechanical, receiving and circulation.*

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

Councilmember Hurt made a motion to accept the text amendment to Ordinance 1943, as amended, for **Stoneridge Office Building (Tristar)** and to forward it to City Council with a recommendation for approval. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Fults and **passed** by a voice vote of 4 to 0.

**Note: One bill, as recommended by the Planning Commission, will be needed for the November 1, 2004 City Council Meeting.
See Bill #**

IV. PENDING PROJECTS/DEPARTMENTAL UPDATE

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.